debtor and will also issue orders for amins giving a sufficient description of properties in inventories.

Subject No. 39.

Sales of immovable property connected with decrees of Civil Courts.

Mr. Nadig Sivappa, Sorab Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—By conducting sales of immovable property in execution of decrees of Civil Courts by Amins, the defendants (Judgment debtors) are subjected to heavy loss and deception. It is therefore solicited that such sales of Civil Courts may be ordered to be conducted by Revenue Officers.

Reply of Government.—This subject was brought up in 1903. The proposal appears to be impracticable. The Revenue Commissioner's views, however, have been called for.

Subject No. 40.

Sureties for attached movables.

Mr. Bhaskara Rao, Sorab Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—When sureties for attached movables do not produce the same, the parties are compelled to bring a suit against them. This increases litigation. Provision may therefore be made in the Civil Procedure Code to enable the parties to proceed against the sureties after decree on the execution side. This was represented last year to which a reply was given that the matter would again be brought to the notice of the Chief Court. It is requested that early orders may be passed on the subject.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

Subject No. 41.

Early disposal of appeals in Chief Court.

Mr. Krishna Iyengar of Turuvekere Sub-Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—Appeals are dragged on in the Chief Court for 6 or 7 years and parties are put to great loss thereby. Arrangements may be made for early disposal of appeals.

Reply of Government.—The Chief Court may be relied upon to expedite disposal of cases.

Subject No. 42.

Reduction of Small Cause jurisdiction of certain Sub-Judges' Courts.

Mr. Subba Rao.

Summary of Discussion—The Small Cause jurisdiction of the newly constituted Sub-Judges' Courts (at Chitaldrug etc.,) which is fixed at Rs. 300 may be reduced to Rs. 100 like those of Bangalore and other places, as the parties are denied the right of appeal in cases disposed of by them within Rs. 300, which is the general limit of money transaction.

Mr. Nagappa's proposal refers to the Sub-Judge's Court at Chitaldrug.

Reply of Government.—The subject is under consideration.

Subject No. 43.

Small Cause jurisdiction, of Sub-Judges.

Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Row, B. A., L. L. B., Advocate, Shimoga Municipality.
Mr. C. Subba Row, Advocate, Nagar Sabha.

Summary of discussion.—The pecuniary jurisdiction of the Sub-Judges in Small Cause cases may be reduced from Rs. 300 to Rs. 100 as the transactions in the moffusil are between sowcars and the raiyats; this jurisdiction causes hardship in the case of the latter. Small Cause jurisdiction will be best exercised in dealings between persons of equal status and opportunities, as between a merchant and a merchant at Bangalore.

Reply of Government.—*Vide* subject No. 42.